



ITW

IN THE US PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/619,287

Filing date: 07/15/2003

First Named Inventor: **Wen C. Huang**

Application Title: **DIRECT WRITE PROCESS AND APPARATUS**

Examiner: **Charles R. Kasenge**

Art Unit: **2125**

Mailed October 10, 2006

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

The Office Action mailed 09/26/2006 indicated that (a) claims 1-31 are allowed, (b) claims 32, 39 and 40 are rejected, and (c) claims 33-38, 41 and 42 are objected.

Thank you for approving claims 1-31. May I please request that the Office re-consider the aforementioned claim rejection and objection for the following justifications:

(1) The Office Action stated that "*Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jang U.S. Patent 6,180,049.*" May I humbly say that the apparatus disclosed by Jang and Yang (my colleagues at Nanotek Instruments, Inc., the same assignee as the present invention) is patently distinct and different from the apparatus defined in claim 32 of my instant invention. My invention is NOT an obvious extension of Jang and Yang's earlier invention, further explained as follows:

(A) Jang and Yang (US 6,180,049) disclosed an apparatus to fabricate a 3-D object that involves using a laser beam to induce a chemical reaction of a **vapor** phase material, resulting in chemical vapor deposition (CVD) of a material onto a target surface in a point-by-point and layer-by-layer manner. The most critical components of Jang and Yang's apparatus are a phase-change chamber to accommodate a small amount of **organic vapor** and a laser beam to convert an amount of the organic vapor in the laser